

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 29

Saturday, July 16, 1955

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Airlift In Wisconsin: Labor union terrorism in Wisconsin has created an extraordinary situation which has captured the indignant attention of members of Congress. The latter fear that the ambition of Walter Reuther to rivet airtight monopoly control on industry may lead to further labor trouble which — in turn — would interfere with the present business prosperity. For the Wisconsin Story is not merely the Kohler Story; it is also the Reuther Story.

The extraordinary situation in that state is the result of a last desperate effort of the famous CIO leader — who lost the strike against the Kohler Company, plumbing manufacturers of Kohler, Wisconsin — to shut off raw materials to that firm. Last week the activity of labor goons (who had previously failed to prevent the employees of Kohler from working) caused a riot in Sheboygan (near to Kohler). This prevented the unloading of a shipload of clay for the Kohler potteries, for the pro-labor mayor of the town failed to enforce law and order. The ship owners then transferred their vessel to Milwaukee for unloading, the cargo to be transshipped by rail to Kohler. But, again, the long arm of Reuther blocked the unloading of the clay, and the vessel left to return to Montreal.

In Milwaukee, it is important to note, a combination of CIO and AFL union forces prevented the discharge of the clay cargo, and the Socialist mayor of Milwaukee showed no more desire to maintain law and order than did the mayor of Sheboygan.

Citizens of Wisconsin, appalled by this incident, talk of an "airlift" to bring the clay to the Kohler Company (recalling the U.S. airlift to Berlin, Germany, when Communist outlawry prevented the transportation of foodstuffs into that German city).

Meanwhile, in the nation's capital, observers view the dramatic episode as raising the following important questions:

(1) Mob violence. Obviously, the mayor of Sheboygan bowed to mob violence which prevented the unloading of the ship. This constitutes a grave local problem, which could be solved by the Wisconsin Governor using state forces to maintain order.

(2) In Milwaukee, the mayor failed to prevent a combination of AFL and CIO forces from stopping discharge of the cargo. As seen here, this may constitute an unlawful secondary boycott in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act and the National Labor Relations Board might have to obtain an injunction against such a secondary boycott.

(3) Walter Reuther. That ambitious labor leader up to now has lost the strike against the plumbing manufacturer. Production has returned to normal and most of the employees are back to work. In labor circles, it is recognized that this strike defeat has impaired Reuther's prestige. That individual reportedly aspires to run for President on a labor party ticket in 1960. The recent AFL-CIO merger is a part of Reuther's plan for obtaining power. Here it is asked — what attitude will President George Meany of the AFL (who is slated to head the merged labor federation) take towards this situation in Wisconsin? Meany is said to be a conservative.

(4) In the Milwaukee phase of the ship affair, the local AFL State, County and City Employees Union refused to unload the ship in that port. Is this evidence of a monopoly — ask Capital observers — which impedes the free flow of interstate commerce?

(5) Finally, the root of the whole Kohler affair is diagnosed here as the determination of the labor bosses to impose compulsory unionism on all workers, whether the latter wish it or not. For the strike was called despite the fact that Kohler's wages — weekly average, \$87.45 — were higher than any manufacturing wages with which comparisons could be made. The plumbing industry's average was \$76.04. Kohler has substantially met wage demands. But the union sticks to its demand for compulsory unionism in the Kohler plant. In short, it just wants power.

Some 18 states have enacted "right-to-work" laws to thwart compulsory unionism. The Kohler story is a chapter in the history of this spreading movement.

Stock Market: Some of the recent trading has been described, by Washington experts, as hectic; they refer to the sharp jump-up of prices of GM shares. Economists here wondered if speculative fever wasn't mounting. Then came some sell-offs. In any case, it is agreed here, little can be done to check speculation. Raising the margin to 100 percent obviously would do little good. Only a rise in the rediscount rate would prove effective and that would affect a far wider area of the economy than the stock market. It is rumored that the "Fed" — Federal Reserve Bank — is sorely perplexed over the problem. And the President's economic advisers are said to be worried. They wonder whether the economy can stand two booms, one in '55 and another in '56, without a bust.

As Geneva Opens: Senator John Butler (R., Md.), on the eve of the conference, warned his constituents not to be too hopeful in view of the fact that "in the past 25 years the Soviet Union has been a party to 52 international agreements, 50 of which they have blithely violated." These agreements, the Maryland Senator said, "have been the end result of some 3,400 meetings between the representatives of the United States and Soviet Russia since 1933."

Some American newspapers have been reportedly alerting their correspondents and news agencies to get on the trail of Professor Owen Lattimore, who was granted a passport recently and has been lecturing in European countries. They want to know if he is in Geneva.

To Save Russia: Miss Freda Uteley develops a thesis (see this week's Article Section) that the Geneva Conference may well end with a weird agreement — the U.S. would financially and economically underwrite Russia's recovery, via the satellite governments. This guess is not so novel or strange as it may seem at first. HUMAN EVENTS has previously, over a decade ago, pointed out the incongruous fact that twice in history, the U.S. saved Russia from apparently impossible situations.

First, in 1934, the U.S. rescued Russia by the Roosevelt gold purchase policy. "The Soviet

Union," we wrote in the July 5, 1944 issue, "had suffered from a deficit in its export-import balance for years. But the rise in the gold price, by American action, enabled the gold-producing Soviet Union overnight to wipe out its deficit. The 'prosperity' period of 1934-36, so often hailed by Soviet sympathizers, was actually greatly in debt to the American currency move." This "prosperity" period followed the truly dire crisis of the early Thirties, when famine stalked the Soviet Union and millions of Russians died of starvation.

The second extraordinary case of rescue occurred during World War II when Russia, hard pressed by the German armies deep in its heartland, was saved by the American-backed policy of the second front in France. The plan for a second front in Northern Europe was strongly resisted, in councils, by the British strategists who wanted a new front established, instead, in the Balkans — to prevent Soviet control of Eastern Europe once Germany collapsed. The American strategy of the second front in France prevailed. Russia was saved and thereby enabled to move into the power vacuum in Eastern Europe — with consequences now unhappily before the public.

Two years ago — the Soviet internal crisis loomed, and again the U.S. took a stand which in effect aided Russia. Two years ago last month, the German uprising in East Berlin occurred. The GOP campaign pledge had been to aid subject countries against Soviet imperialistic control. But, when in June, 1953, the Soviet rulers faced grave unrest from the subject peoples of Eastern Europe, this GOP pledge was forgotten and the Germans and Poles, then in ferment, received no diplomatic or spiritual aid in their resistance to their masters.

Today's internal crisis in the USSR seems to be a prolongation of that of 1953. Miss Uteley sketches in the outline of another possible American appeasement which would serve to "save" the Soviet regime again.

McCarthy: This week, the Senate Republican and Democratic leadership united in a bipartisan move proclaiming "hope" for freedom of Communist-enslaved peoples. Observers regard this

resolution as a direct result of Senator McCarthy's demand of a fortnight ago that the Big Four conference be called off unless the subject of the freedom of the Soviet satellite countries (Poland, Hungary, etc.) be placed on the agenda at Geneva. The Wisconsin Senator's proposal was overwhelmingly defeated, by record vote.

But a measure of victory arose from the ashes of this defeat. The McCarthy demand met with great approval among the "language groups" of voters which are powerful in a number of states — in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin. Politicians estimate this vote as in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 — enough to swing a general election. Many Senators who put themselves on record against the Wisconsin man's proposal have squirmed uncomfortably ever since. Hence both Democratic and GOP leaders felt it necessary to "get them off the hook" and to "clear" the record with the bipartisan resolution which — watered down as it is — nevertheless is aimed at conciliating the sentiments of millions of voters who would like to see their ancestral homelands free from Soviet domination.

It will be difficult now for either Party to consent to a Geneva settlement which ignores the feelings of these powerful voting groups. To that extent, McCarthy has scored.

Dixon-Yates: TVA supporters are striving hard to portray President Eisenhower's cancellation of the controversial Dixon-Yates contract as an outstanding victory for public power and a serious blow to his political prestige.

The truth is that the President only did what was economically sound in cancelling the contract, and the triumph of TVA and the cause of public power — as ballyhooed by the Democrats — do not square with the facts. The Dixon-Yates interests were to construct a plant in Arkansas across the river from Memphis. This plant when built was to turn over its power to TVA for use in the Memphis area which is served by TVA. TVA would then be able to turn over an equivalent amount of power to plants of the Atomic Energy Commission thus saving large costs in transmission

lines to the Dixon-Yates plant which was doing business with the AEC.

When Memphis decided to build its own generating system the private plant became economically indefensible because there was no way for the plant to serve AEC plants except through the construction of transmission lines which would make its power too costly. Under such circumstances there was nothing left for President Eisenhower to do but abrogate the Dixon-Yates contract.

But just how its abrogation yields a triumph to TVA and public power is difficult to see. The fact is that TVA is facing reverses which its socialist promoters are viewing with consternation. Under the Eisenhower Administration there have been *no new starts in public power*. The two Congresses since the Administration took office have refused to give TVA any Federal money to build new steam plants. The Administration and Congress have taken the position that any further expansion of the TVA system is the responsibility of the people of Tennessee. In substance, TVA has been driven away from the public trough in Washington and told to rustle up its own expansion funds — a setback to the socialistic planners who counted on TVA enjoying perpetual nourishment from the Federal Treasury.

Finally, there are unmistakable signs that the unsound and unfair nature of TVA's cheap power rates is breeding resentment in Congress. These rates are as low as they are chiefly because of TVA's privilege as a government corporation to dodge taxes and avoid paying a fair return on the hundreds of millions of dollars of capital it obtained from the taxpayers. There looms a definite threat that Congress may ultimately compel TVA to compete on fair terms with private utilities. If that happens, the carefully cultivated illusion that TVA can produce electricity more cheaply than private companies will be quickly dissipated.

Bricker Amendment: The Bricker amendment, reported favorably by a Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is at present bogged down in the full Committee. There is still a chance that a full Committee will yet report it out

favorably to the Senate, but the chances of a Senate vote on the measure this session are slight.

There is a definite feeling among those supporting the amendment that the best time for a vote will be the next session of the present Congress.

The hearings held by the Subcommittee have had an influential effect on the upper Chamber — particularly the testimony of Dr. George A. Finch, eminent international legal scholar, who was formerly head of the Carnegie Endowment. The Finch testimony was a powerful and exhaustive analysis of the legal necessity for the amendment and it has made a strong appeal to the lawyers in the Senate.

Next year one third of the Senate, including many opponents of the Bricker Amendment, will be up for re-election. There is strong grassroots sentiment for the measure (the result of five years of effort) as well as the backing of many local bar leaders. For the amendment has three times been endorsed overwhelmingly by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. In an election year these supporters are counted on to win over some Senators who, but for an election year, would continue to line up with the internationalists bent on burying the amendment.

Once the Bricker measure hurdles the Senate, authoritative sources say, it should roll through the House where every member is up for re-election next year.

Education Front: The Brooklyn *Tablet* (July 2) quotes Paul Harvey, radio commentator: "Catholic universities alert! The Fund for the Republic which operates with Ford Foundation funds, has approached Georgetown University, offering much money if that university would conduct a study of 'the testimony of government witnesses.'"

"University officials who turned it down did so because they got the impression that all the Fund

for the Republic was really interested in was to get a Catholic school to do a smear job on Budenz, Bentley and Chambers.

"Georgetown, even at these prices, would not lend itself to an expedition intended only to dig for dirt."

The *Tablet* remarks: "Meanwhile, we must wait to see if the new committee of 15 adopts a radically different policy from its sisters and parent or if it, too, will still watch the pennies in doling out pittances to Catholic colleges and universities."

In The Magazines: A new magazine *Know The Facts* has just been launched in Washington under the editorship of Martha Rountree, star TV commentator. It offers monthly a "dictionary of national and international issues," giving both sides on all important questions. *Know The Facts* is published at 1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Subscription price \$3.00 a year.

● The *American Mercury* for August offers, among others, three outstanding pieces: "Mr. Eisenhower and the Socialized State" by Willard Edwards; "The What and How of Communist Fronts," by J. B. Matthews; and "ADA: A Democratic Problem," by Ralph de Toledano.

Letter from KENNETH COLEGROVE, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Northwestern University: "The weekly issues of HUMAN EVENTS should be consistently studied by every social science teacher in the high schools as well as colleges and universities. They uncover the realities of national and international events, illuminate hidden trends, expose false propaganda and correct erroneous impressions conveyed by the press and news commentators. HUMAN EVENTS is an indispensable teacher's aid in history, political science, economics and sociology."

FRANK C. HANICHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.

Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 3 weeks for \$1. Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3. By first class mail, \$11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$12 a year; airmail, \$18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. 1954 volume now ready.**

Article Section

GENEVA — AND A NEW PATTERN OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

By FRED A UTLEY

BEHIND THE SPOTLIGHTED stage at Geneva, the vague shape of what may prove to be a new pattern of Soviet imperialism is dimly visible. Evidence that an up-to-date model of Communist imperialism was in the blueprint stage was available early last year at another conference of ill omen.

In an article I wrote for HUMAN EVENTS, "Berlin: The Republican Yalta," published on March 10, 1954, I wrote:

"An American friend of mine who is sympathetic to the British viewpoint, told me — when I arrived in Berlin — that he knew from both reliable British and close-to-Eisenhower American sources, that before the conference, under cover of atomic talks, Dulles and the Soviet Ambassador had worked out a compromise in Washington. According to his sources, the U.S. would accept 'the fact' that we have no alternative short of war but to recognize the Red Chinese Government. Soviet Russia for her part was to recognize that she had no alternative but to give up East Germany, and to permit the reunification of Germany, provided that it was agreed that a united and free Germany was not obligated to join the European Defense Community."

On leaving Berlin at the tail end of the conference, I twitted my expatriate American friend concerning his incorrect prognosis. He insisted that the deal had not fallen through, but had merely been postponed.

Today signs accumulate that he was right. During the seventeen months which have elapsed since the Berlin conference, American opinion has been softened up to the point of welcoming the re-leashing of Chiang Kai-shek, and has been subjected to such a barrage of fear-the-atom propaganda, that it has come to agree with the

President that "there is no alternative to peace." Logically, this means that we are ready to pay for peace in our time, at any cost to the future security of America, as well as by the repudiation of the Republican campaign promise to end

"the negative, futile and immoral policy of 'containment' which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction."

One year after the Berlin conference, on March 2 last, the President at his press conference made a statement which openly proclaimed that the platform on which his party won the election had been thrown into the ashcan. This was the occasion when, in reply to a question concerning Chiang Kai-shek's expectation that he would receive American moral and logistical support for an invasion of the Chinese mainland, Eisenhower replied: "The United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war."

By designating any attempt by the Free Chinese to liberate their countrymen from Communist tyranny as "an aggressive war," the President gave *de facto* recognition to the Chinese Communist government. Why, therefore, should he not proceed to give it *de jure* recognition by agreeing to its admission to the United Nations? And why should the Chinese Communists not agree to become one of the "peace-loving" powers which are supposed to constitute the UN, provided that they can get almost all they want without fighting?

I am not suggesting that Eisenhower will go so far as to sacrifice Formosa to our enemies as a burnt offering on the altar of "peace," or that he would agree to deliver our loyal Chinese allies to death or torture and slavery according to the precedent set at Yalta by Roosevelt for the Poles. But the odds today would seem to be in favor of the sort of deal which failed to materialize at Berlin in February, 1954, coming out of the "summit" conference at Geneva this month.

At Berlin, Soviet Russia got her *quid* without being forced to give any *quo*. Molotov, having made it clear that his main purpose in meeting with the Western Powers was not to negotiate a German or Austrian settlement but to prepare the way for a "Five Power" conference with Red China, got what he wanted without having to give anything in return. Subsequently, at the Geneva conference last summer, Chou En-lai was able to charm, or seduce, or frighten, the representatives of France and Britain into giving Indo-China to the Communists little by little, while Mr. Dulles washed his hands of all responsibility.

Today the Soviet position is so weak and ours so strong, that it might seem impossible that the West should once again agree to give much and get nothing. But the Communists are adept at turning their weaknesses to advantage, in the manner of the jujitsu wrestler who uses his opponent's strength to throw him for a fall. It is therefore not inconceivable that the rulers of the Communist Empire in Europe and China may succeed at Geneva in making America pay for the retreat which their economic and political difficulties require. They may even be able to make us believe that their advantage is our gain, as happened when they signed the treaty with Austria.

THE SUICIDAL TENDENCY of the West to shy away from realities and indulge in make-believe was most strikingly displayed when this treaty was hailed as the first sign of a new dawn, instead of as a cloud

now no bigger than a man's hand which may soon darken the horizon of the free world. For the Soviet treatment of Austria foreshadows a new pattern of Communist imperialist rule which, if followed elsewhere in Europe and Asia, is likely to prove far more successful in strengthening and extending the Soviet Empire than the primitive barbaric method of enslaving peoples and holding them down by terror, hitherto employed by the Communists.

Since 1945, this little country has been looted by Russia of half a billion dollars worth of oil and industrial equipment, plus uncounted amounts of personal property and goods seized by the Red Army. It was saved from starvation and rehabilitated by American aid amounting to one and a half billion dollars. Now, by the terms of the Austrian treaty, it must pay 320 million dollars to Russia in oil and manufactured goods, plus another 20 million if Austria decides to redeem her Danubian shipping, seized by the Soviets as "war booty." This means that the "liberated" Austrians are to pay, or have already paid, a larger *per capita* ransom than defeated Finland, whose four million people paid an indemnity of 227 million dollars for their equally precarious freedom. At the same time, the Austrians are deprived of the protection afforded by the presence of United States troops, while Italy is endangered by the severing of direct communication via the Brenner Pass between the NATO forces in the peninsula and those in Germany. Ringed around by the Red Army in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and with no better protection at its rear than Yugoslavia, whose "neutrality" against the West has been assured by Tito's support of Soviet foreign policy objectives, Austria faces a future in which she will have no choice but to work willingly for Russia.

THE PROFITS DERIVED by the Kremlin from the Austrian treaty are substantial, but cannot be compared to the dividends our enemies would receive should

they induce the Germans to buy the freedom of their enslaved countrymen in East Germany on the same *per capita* reckoning as Austria. The three billion dollars which would thus accrue to Russia would relieve the immediate desperate need of the creaking Soviet economy. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), by its very nature, blights its peoples' endeavor to produce and enjoy the fruits of the earth, and therefore has little or nothing to offer in exchange for the food and manufactures it requires. But the Kremlin can still hope to get them for nothing if the West can be terrorized into paying tribute to the barbarians on its frontiers for the sake of "peace in our time."

Should all the satellite countries be offered "freedom" on terms similar to those accepted by Austria, the profit which would come to the Communist Empire would exceed by far the diminishing returns which the Kremlin now receives from these looted lands. The high cost of terrorizing all their people all the time constitutes so large an overhead charge that the "surplus value" obtainable from their forced labors must be negligible.

What therefore could be more advantageous to Moscow and Peking than an arrangement whereby the subject peoples should, like Austria, agree to work for the Communists for a decade as the price of their "freedom and sovereignty?" Since the Red Army would be close by, there would be no risk of the "liberated" peoples not paying the many pounds of flesh demanded for their release from servitude. Nor is there much doubt that if the burden of these ransom payments should prove too heavy for them to bear, Uncle Sam would be ready, as usual, to pay the reparations demanded by her former "allies" from the countries we have either defeated or liberated.

The Austrians confidently expect that the United States will give them the means to pay their bill to Russia. And every other country, which tells us that — without a gift of dollars — it must "go Communist,"

can always count upon a fat check from Washington. Moreover it would seem to be a "principle" of American foreign policy to be more generous to doubtful friends and neutrals, or to those who blackmail us, than to staunch allies who stand unequivocally on our side. This is shown, in particular, by our niggardliness toward Turkey and the Free Chinese, as compared with the large amounts given to Yugoslavia and India, which do not even pretend to support our foreign policy.

As Constantine Brown, Foreign Editor of the *Washington Star*, recently pointed out, Turkey, which spends 60% of its budget to maintain 21 combat divisions, and is willing to fight anywhere at our side, as shown by its valuable contribution in the Korean war, was recently refused a requested *loan* of 300 million dollars and allowed only a paltry 30 million. In contrast to this, consider the billion we gave to France last year for the war in Indo-China which she failed to fight; or the *gift*, recently approved by Congress, of 150 million dollars to India and Yugoslavia, both of which virtually endorse the Kremlin's foreign policy.

WHY, THEREFORE, shouldn't the rulers of the Communist world calculate that, in case they decide to let the satellite countries go free, America would pour billions into them in order to enable them to pay reparations to Moscow and to recover from their ten years of subjection to Communist rule?

Since American action is based on the erroneous supposition that poverty is the parent of Communism, and pursues the self-defeating policy of being more generous to neutrals and doubtful allies than to our real friends — the Kremlin now has an opportunity to work a wonderful racket.

One can still hope that the reluctance always shown by Communists to relinquish their grasp on anything they possess, or to lift their Iron Heel from the prostrate body of those they have conquered and cowed,

may prevent them from taking advantage of their wonderful opportunity. But should Stalin's heirs be clever enough, they could induce us to strengthen the Soviet economy by indirect subsidies in the form of ransom money, and a new Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of the satellite countries, whose "freedom" may be offered in exchange for the *de jure* recognition of Red China, and what is of even greater importance — the removal of all trade embargoes. In a word, Moscow and Peking could, in all probability, get us to pay twice over for concessions to our "positions of strength." The latter would in reality not be concessions at all, but a shift of Communist imperialism from one form of exploitation to another.

Stupid or shortsighted as the Western powers have been, the Communists have often been even more blind to their long-term interests. Thus it may be that they will now prove too set in their old ways, to take the risk of imitating the British 19th-century method of ruling and exploiting Asiatic and African peoples by remote control.

Before Winston Churchill succeeded in liquidating it by his war policies, our English cousins ruled over an empire on which the sun never sets, by the simple expedient of utilizing the native ruling, or possessing, classes as her agents in subjugating and exploiting those whom Kipling called "the lesser breeds without the law;" and by using her Navy to compel obedience to her dictates. Should the Communists choose to learn the lesson taught by "capitalist imperialist" Britain, they could be sure of making all the countries of Eastern and

Central Europe — perhaps even including Germany — work for them, by offering the carrot of freedom while threatening them with the stick of the Red Army on their frontiers. At the same time, they could count upon continuing indirect unpaid imports from America in the form of gifts given to keep these countries from "going Communist."

Finally the United States might become so exhausted by the effort of paying for the ephemeral freedom of Moscow's and Peking's client states, and might have caused so many of our trustworthy friends to abandon our cause in despair, that we would be ripe for conquest ourselves. Such a conquest would not even be necessary, provided we undertook to pay tribute direct to the Communist Empire in place of gifts to the countries it controls.

This dire future prospect may be only a nightmare; but it could come true unless we cease to behave like Little Red Riding Hood. At Geneva, our best hope lies in the possibility that Khrushchev or Bulganin (or Mao Tse-tung or Chou En-lai, or whoever else now rules over the Communist Empire), may become so confident of their ability to hoodwink us that they will overreach themselves. The Greeks had a word, *hubris*, for the overwhelming pride and self confidence, and contempt for the rights of others, which lead men to destruction.

If we cannot trust to our own intelligence and resolution, we can perhaps hope that our enemies will ask so much and offer so little that even President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden and Monsieur Faure will reject their offer to end the cold war on terms fatal to the free world.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for \$1; 10 for \$1.50; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10; 500 for \$15; 1,000 for \$25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year. Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for \$1.